

REMARKS

Claims 28-44 are pending in the application, with claims 28, 32, 36, 39, and 42 being independent. Claims 28, 29, 36, 39, and 42 have been amended. Support for the amendments to claim 28, 29, 36, 39, and 42, that the first image comprises at least one of red, green, and blue images and that the second image is entirely white, may be found in the last paragraph of page 21 in the specification. Support for the overlapping of the two images may be found in the second paragraph of page 22 in the specification. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicant acknowledges with appreciation the allowance of claims 32-35 and submits that the amendments to claims 32 and 33 address only minor informalities.

Claims 28-31 have been rejected under section 103(a) as unpatentable over Mogi (5,376,944). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Mogi does not describe or suggest "a first active matrix circuit for generating a first image comprising at least one of a red image, a green image and a blue image" and "a second active matrix circuit for generating a second image comprising a white image," "where the second image overlaps the first image," as recited in amended claim 28.

In particular, the Office Action states that the first and second active matrix circuits are shown as "X1-X119" and "X120-X238." While Mogi may suggest separate driving circuits for "X1-X119" and "X120-X238," Mogi does not describe or suggest using X1-X119 to generate a red, blue, or green image and X120-X238 to generate a white image such that the images overlap. Consequently, Mogi does not describe or suggest this feature of claim 28.

The Office Action took Official Notice that "using liquid crystal display devices to display different color of image signals is well known in the art." Applicant does not understand "using liquid crystal display devices to display different color of image signals" to mean "a first active matrix circuit for generating a first image comprising at least one of a red image, a green image and a blue image," and "a second active matrix circuit for generating a second image comprising a white image," where "the second image overlaps the first image," as recited in claim 28. If the Office Action intends to take Official Notice that the claimed features are standard practice, applicant traverses this assertion and respectfully requests that the next Office

Action support the finding with adequate evidence, in accordance with the MPEP, Chapter 2144.03(C). Such features are not standard practice in the art.

Claims 36¹, 37, 38, 40, 41, 43, and 44 have been rejected under section 103(a) as unpatentable over Verhulst (5,007,715). Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because Verhulst does not describe or suggest “a first active matrix circuit for generating a first image comprising at least one of a red image, a green image and a blue image,” and “a second active matrix circuit for generating a second image comprising a white image,” as recited in amended claim 36.

In particular, Verhulst is directed to a stereo-scopic picture display device² to display images of different optical polarization for the right and left eye. Nowhere does Verhulst describe or suggest “a first active matrix circuit for generating a first image comprising at least one of a red image, a green image and a blue image,” and “a second active matrix circuit for generating a second image comprising a white image.” Further, applicant does not understand the Official Notice to mean that the claim language as described above is known in the art.

Claims 39 and 42 have been rejected under section 102(b) as unpatentable over Verhulst. Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection because, as noted above, Verhulst does not describe or suggest “a first active matrix circuit for generating a first image comprising at least one of a red image, a green image and a blue image,” and “a second active matrix circuit for generating a second image comprising a white image,” as recited in amended claims 39 and 42.

¹ Page 3, Paragraph 3 of the Office Action states “Regarding claim 32...” given the Verhulst rejection in its entirety and the indicated allowable claims, Applicant believes “32” is an error and should read “36.”

² See Verhulst, Column 1, Lines 8-14

Applicant : Shunpei Yamazaki et al.
Serial No. : 10/633,676
Filed : August 5, 2003
Page : 8 of 8


Attorney's Docket No.: 07977-
074002 / US3108/3110/3195D1

Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance. Please apply any charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _____

7/27/06



John F. Hayden
Reg. No. 37,640

Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W.
11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331